

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 1-17, 37-54, 56-59, 67, 69, 70, and 74-80 are pending in the application and are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,324,541 to de l'Etraz (hereinafter "de l'Etraz") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,003,546 to Cheah (hereinafter "Cheah"). Claims 1-4, 9, 17, 37, 38, 53, 54, 57, 59, and 67 are amended. With these changes, the applicants respectfully submit that all of the remaining claims are now in condition for allowance.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

A. Summary

It is admitted in the office action at page 5 that de l'Etraz does not disclose either the administration routine or the change management routine and the action advances Cheah for disclosing the same. However, Cheah does not teach or suggest either routine as recited in amended claims 1, 37, 54, and 67. While amended claims 1, 37, 54, and 67 generally recite detecting changes made to contact information within user collections and modifying a centralized firm collection to reflect the decentralized changes, Cheah discloses that each user or administrator is only able to manage how his or her personal or corporate information appears or is modified to the other users with which he or she has previously exchanged contact information. As an illustrative example of the differences between claims 1, 37, 54, and 67, the particular recitations of amended claim 1 and the advantages it generally recites are described in contrast to the teachings of Cheah, below.

B. Cheah

Cheah is generally directed to an Internet-based contact management system. Cheah describes that users enter and store their own, personal contact data (e.g., their own name, address, phone number, etc.), view a set of available contacts, request, and exchange other users' personal contact data that those other users have individually entered. The system disclosed by Cheah exchanges contact information among users' machines through a central server that receives the request for another user's contact information from a particular user's machine. The contact information entered by each user and exchanged between the users is

entirely self-representative by the user. (Col. 26, lines 37-44). That is, each user only owns and maintains his or her personal information that he or she entered.

In other words, Cheah discloses that User A enters and stores his Contact Data A on a server. Other Users B and C enter and store their respective Contact Data B and C on the server, as well. The disclosed server now includes Contact Data A, B, and C. User A may individually request an exchange of contact data with User B and, upon approval of User B, User A will have visibility of Contact Data B and User B will have visibility of Contact Data A; both Contact Data A and B being stored on the server. Also, User B may individually request an exchange of contact data with User C and, upon approval of User C, User B will now have visibility of Contact Data A and C, while User C will have visibility of Contact Data B; Contact Data A, B, and C now being stored on the server. Despite User B's visibility of Contact Data A and C, User B cannot exchange Contact Data C with User A, and User A has no ability to request an exchange of Contact Data C unless User A requests the exchange directly from User C. This exchange of data grows exponentially more complex as the number of users increases.

Changes to the user-entered data described by Cheah reflect the self-representative nature of the data and the data exchange described above. This change process is clearly described in Cheah at col. 23, line 40 through col. 25, line 21. For example, User A may change his or her Contact Data A stored on the server, User B may change his or her Contact Data B stored on the server, and User C may change his or her Contact Data C stored on the server. However, no user may change another user's contact data. To update the changed profiles, the system described by Cheah initiates update profile processing that "determines that one or more profiles have been updated on the system server...." (Col. 24, lines 55-67). Continuing with the example described above, Cheah discloses that the server that stores Contact Data A, B, and C determines that User A has updated his data to Contact Data A'. The server detects the change on the server, then automatically distributes Contact Data A' only to the users that have "previously received a copy of the outdated profile" (col. 25, lines 1-13), or, using this example, to User B alone, as User C never exchanged data with User A.

Cheah also discloses a corporate administrator application that manages corporate contact information (e.g., the corporate image, appearance, logo, or address) that has been previously exchanged between users. (Col. 29, lines 25-59 and col. 30, lines 32-42).

Updates to the corporate contact information are made at an administrator machine and forwarded to a central server to be automatically distributed to all employees that included the corporate contact information in their personal data, as described above. Those registered users having previously received the corporate contact information would then receive the updated corporate contact information, or notification of its availability, through the administrator application. (Col. 30, lines 49-60). Like each user's personal contact information discussed above, Cheah discloses that the corporate contact information entered by each corporate administrator and exchanged between the users is entirely self-representative by each of the corporate administrators. (Col. 30, lines 32-42). While the corporate administrators may limit the availability of the corporate contact information to employees, processing changes to this information is no different than processing changes to the user contact information. That is, each corporate administrator only owns and maintains the corporate contact information that he or she entered.

Changes to the administrator-entered data described by Cheah also reflect the self-representative nature of the corporate data and data exchange. Cheah generally describes the administrator application at col. 29, line 25 through col. 34, line 39 and the change process particularly at col. 30, lines 43-64. Continuing with the example described above, Cheah discloses that User A and User B may exchange their personal Contact Data A and B, respectively. When entering his data, User A may have included Corporate Data Q in his Contact Data A ("Contact Data A_Q"). Administrator-user Q "is responsible for control over at least the basic corporate contact information so that corporate image (e.g., appearance, logo, etc.) are consistent and centrally controlled." (Col. 30, lines 38-41). Administrator-user Q may alter the Corporate Data Q to Corporate Data Q' and save the data to the server. The server may then distribute the Corporate Data Q' to all users that previously received Contact Data A_Q. Thus, User B would automatically have visibility of Contact Data A_Q. Cheah also describes that Administrator-user Q may associate employees with Corporate Data Q, however exchange and update processing among those employees associated with Corporate Data Q would proceed as described in the above example.

C. Claim 1

Amended claim 1 generally recites a relationship management system that includes a first database with individual user collections of contact files, a second database with a firm

collection of all the different contact files within the user collections, and two routines to manage changes made to contacts within the user collections: an administration routine and a change management routine. The administration routine detects any changes made to contact files within the user collections, generates an event action in response to detecting the change, and sends a message that includes the event action to an administrator of the system, where the changed contact file pertains to one or more contacts other than the user associated with the changed user collection. The change management routine then receives a response to the event action from the administrator, and processes the response by making the change to the corresponding second contact file within the firm collection and provides an option to make the change to the remaining user collections.

For example, claim 1 generally recites that User A may enter Contact Data C, D, and E (associated with User or Non-User C, D, and E) in User A's user collection, and User B may enter Contact Data C, D, and Z (again, associated with User or Non-User C, D, and Z) in User B's user collection. The firm collection would then contain Contact Data C, D, E, and Z. If User A and/or B changes their user collection copy of Contact Data C to Contact Data C', the administration routine detects that changed Contact Data C' within either or both of User A or B's user collection, generates an event action in response, and sends a message including the event action to an administrator. The change routine receives a response to the event action from the administrator, and processes that response by updating the firm collection to reflect Contact Data C'. The firm collection then contains Contact Data C', D, E, and Z. The change management routine also provides an option to make a corresponding change to the remaining users that include the now-outdated Contact Data C within their user collections.

Generally, the recitations of claim 1 allow each user to keep his or her own private data files for each of the contacts known by the user within a private user collection. The user then personally manages changes either made by the user to his own private data files or made by another user to their private data files, if the firm collection happens to share a changed contact that is common to both of their respective user collections. Through the firm collection, each user also has access to the information about those shared firm contacts as input by other users of the system in their respective private user collections. The

administrator has oversight of the changes made to the firm collection which provides more data integrity and confidence in those shared firm contacts on the part of all the users.

1. Cheah Does Not Teach or Suggest Claim 1

Because the contact data described by Cheah is entirely self-representative, changes to the data must always originate with and be controlled by the owner of that information. Further, once a user changes his or her personal contact data, the central server detects the change to the data and automatically forwards the change other users that previously exchanged the now outdated data. Therefore, Cheah cannot teach or suggest at least:

- the administration routine that detects changes made to the common data within a user collection wherein the changed data includes contact data pertaining to one or more contacts other than the user with access to the changed user collection, or
- the change management routine that processes a response to the event action by making the change to the corresponding data within the firm collection,

as generally recited in amended claim 1.

The differences between the recitations of amended claim 1 and the disclosure of Cheah may be further illustrated using the above examples. As discussed above, claim 1 generally recites that a User Collection A may contain Contact Data C, D, and E. The administration routine detects User A's change to Contact Data C' within User A's user collection and makes a corresponding change to the firm collection. In contrast, Cheah discloses that User A may only change his self-representative personal data to Contact Data A'. In other words, while having visibility of his own Contact Data A as well as Contact Data B, User A in Cheah may only change his personal Contact Data A. Changed Contact Data A' is then distributed to User B who previously executed an exchange with User A. Cheah also discloses Administrator-user Q may only change his self-representative corporate data to Corporate Data Q'. If User A in Cheah had included Corporate Data Q in his private data, then User A's previously-exchanged data is updated to Contact Data A_Q' for User B who previously executed an exchange with User A.

The differences recited in amended claim 1 offer at least two distinct advantages over the teachings of Cheah. First, because claim 1 generally recites an administration routine that detects changes to contact data other than the user's own, private data (i.e., the user's own address, phone number, etc.), each user is able to maintain his or her own data files for each of the contacts known by the user within a privately owned and maintained user collection. Cheah does not teach or suggest this capability. Rather, Cheah discloses self-representative data that can only be changed by the user or administrator who "owns" the data. Once the data owner in Cheah changes his or her data, the changes are forwarded to all other users that previously exchanged the now-outdated data. Thus, it is impossible for Cheah to teach or suggest that a user is able to individually maintain his or her private user collection of data files for each contact (other than him or herself), as generally recited in amended claim 1, because Cheah discloses a system that is only able to collectively maintain self-representative data where each user can only change his or her own, private data (i.e., the user's own address, phone number, etc.).

Second, as also recited in amended claim 1, because the changes to the contact data within the firm collection are only made when an administrator responds to the event action, the administrator has oversight of the changes made to the firm collection, thus providing users more data integrity and confidence in those firm contacts. Cheah does not teach or suggest this capability. Rather, Cheah describes a corporate administrator application that manages corporate contact information (e.g., the corporate image, appearance, logo, or address) that has been previously exchanged between users and, like the user data, is entirely self-representative. That is, the corporate administrator disclosed by Cheah only has oversight of the corporate contact information that he or she entered and cannot maintain any data other than the corporate data the corporate administrator personally entered, unlike the functionality generally recited in amended claim 1.

In sum, Cheah discloses user and administrator actions within a system that only includes self-representative data in which changes to the data must always originate with and be controlled by the owner of that information. Therefore, Cheah cannot teach or suggest at least the administration routine that detects changes made to contact files other than the contact file of the user with access to the changed user collection, or the change management routine that processes an administrator's response to the change. Because neither de l'Etraz

nor Cheah alone or in combination teach or suggest the recitations of amended claim 1, this claim is allowable.

D. Claim 37

The arguments presented above in regard to claim 1 generally apply to the rejection of claim 37. Amended claim 37 generally recites a database storing a plurality of user collections that are each accessible by a user of the system and include different contact files, the database further storing a firm collection that is accessible by an administrator. Claim 37 also recites two routines to manage changes made to contacts within the user collections: an administration routine and a change management routine. The administration routine detects any changes made to contact files within the user collections, generates an event action in response to detecting the change, and sends a message that includes the event action to an administrator of the system, where the changed contact file pertains to one or more contacts other than the user associated with the changed user collection. The change management routine then receives a response to the event action from the administrator, and processes the response by making the change to the corresponding second contact file within the firm collection and provides an option to make the change to the remaining user collections.

1. The Office Action Does Not Allege A *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness Regarding Claim 37

The office action submits de l'Etraz and Cheah for teaching or suggesting elements of claim 37, yet, the action only presents the recitations of claim 1 for this allegation. Therefore, the action does not allege a *prima facie* case of obviousness because the action has not properly alleged that the prior art reference (or references when combined) teaches or suggests each and every limitation as recited in claim 37. Particularly, the action does not allege that these references teach or suggest:

a database... storing a firm collection, wherein the firm collection is accessible by an administrator of the system, the firm collection including a second contact file corresponding to each different first contact file included in the plurality of user collections, wherein each second contact file within the firm collection has data that matches one of the contacts for which a first contact file exists within one or more of the plurality of user collections;

Because the office action fails to allege that the combination of de L'Etraz and Cheah teaches or suggests each and every element of claim 37, the action does not allege a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

2. Cheah Does Not Teach or Suggest Claim 37

It is admitted in the office action at page 5 that de l'Etraz does not disclose either the administration routine or the change management routine as generally recited in claim 37 and the action advances Cheah for disclosing the same. However, Cheah does not teach or suggest either routine as recited in claim 37. Despite the lack of alleging a proper *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Applicants submit that Cheah cannot teach or suggest at least the administration routine that detects changes made to contact files other than the user with access to the changed user collection, or the change management routine that processes an administrator's response to the change as generally recited in claim 37. Rather, Cheah discloses user and administrator actions within a system that only includes self-representative data in which changes to the data must always originate with and be controlled by the owner of that information. Because neither de l'Etraz nor Cheah alone or in combination teach or suggest the recitations of amended claim 37, this claim is allowable.

E. Claim 54

The arguments presented above in regard to claim 1 apply equally to the rejection of claim 54. Amended claim 54 generally recites a database that stores a plurality of first contact files accessible to a user of the system and a second contact file for each different first contact file, the second contact file accessible by an administrator of the system. Claim 54 also recites two routines to manage changes made to contacts within the user collections: an administration routine and a change management routine. The administration routine detects any changes made to the common data of one of the plurality of first contact files, generates an event action in response to detecting the change, and sends a message that includes the event action to an administrator of the system, where the changed common data pertains to one or more contacts other than the user associated with the changed plurality of first contact files. The change management routine then receives a response to the event action from the administrator, and processes the response by making the change to the corresponding second contact file that includes the data in common with the corresponding first contact file.

1. The Office Action Does Not Allege A *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness Regarding Claim 54

The office action submits de l'Etraz and Cheah for teaching or suggesting elements of claim 54, yet, the action only presents the recitations of claim 1 for this allegation. Therefore, the action does not allege a *prima facie* case of obviousness because the action has not properly alleged that the prior art reference (or references when combined) teaches or suggests each and every limitation as recited in claim 54. Particularly, the action does not allege that these references teach or suggest:

a database that stores a plurality of first contact files accessible to a user of the system and a second contact file for each different first contact file, the second contact file accessible by an administrator of the system, wherein each of the second contact files includes data in common with a corresponding first contact file;

Because the office action fails to allege that the combination of de L'Etraz and Cheah teaches or suggests each and every element of claim 54, the action does not allege a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

2. Cheah Does Not Teach or Suggest Claim 54

It is admitted in the office action at page 5 that de l'Etraz does not disclose either the administration routine or the change management routine as generally recited in claim 54 and the action advances Cheah for disclosing the same. However, Cheah does not teach or suggest either routine as recited in claim 54. Despite the lack of alleging a proper *prima facie* case of obviousness, Cheah cannot teach or suggest at least the administration routine that detects changes made to contact files other than the user with access to the changed plurality of first contact files, or the change management routine that processes an administrator's response to the change. Rather, as described above, Cheah discloses user and administrator actions within a system that only includes self-representative data in which changes to the data must always originate with and be controlled by the owner of that information. Therefore, because neither de l'Etraz nor Cheah alone or in combination teach or suggest the recitations of amended claim 54, this claim is allowable.

F. Claim 67

The arguments presented above in regard to claim 1 apply equally to the rejection of claim 67. Amended claim 67 generally recites a database storing a first and second user collection that are respectively accessible by a first and second user of the system and include different contact files, and a second database further storing a firm collection that is accessible by an administrator and includes a duplicate of each different contact file stored in the first and second user collections. Claim 67 also recites two routines to manage changes made to contacts within the user collections: an administration routine and a change management routine. The administration routine detects any changes made to contact files within the first user collection, generates an event action in response to detecting the change, and sends a message that includes the event action to an administrator of the system, where the changed contact file pertains to one or more contacts other than the first user associated with the changed first user collection. The change management routine then receives a response to the event action from the administrator, and processes the response with the second user and second user collection that includes the changed common data. The change management routine also makes the change to the corresponding file within the firm collection.

1. The Office Action Does Not Allege A *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness Regarding Claim 67

The office action submits de l'Etraz and Cheah for teaching or suggesting elements of claim 67, yet, the action only presents the recitations of claim 1 for this allegation. Therefore, the action does not allege a *prima facie* case of obviousness because the action has not properly alleged that the prior art reference (or references when combined) teaches or suggests each and every limitation as recited in claim 67. Particularly, the action does not allege that these references teach or suggest:

- a processor in communication with a memory and a server via an information network, the information network including a plurality of user interfaces and one or more administrator interfaces and employing a communication protocol to facilitate communication between the processor, the memory, the server, and the plurality of user and administrator interfaces, wherein each of the user and administrator interfaces includes a display routine for creating a user interface screen for display on a user interface display screen and an administrator interface screen for display on an administrator interface display

screen and an access routine for communicating with the server via the information network, and the display routine and the access routine facilitate at least one of accessing, storing, deleting, changing, and managing a first database and a second database;

- the first database stored in the memory and including a first user collection accessible to a first user of the system and second user collection accessible to a second user of the system, each user collection including one or more contact files, with the different contact files within each user collection having data pertaining to different contacts; and
- the second database stored in the server and including a firm collection accessible to an administrator of the system, the firm collection including a duplicate contact file for each different contact file included in the first user collection and the second user collection, wherein each of the duplicate contact files within the firm collection includes data associated with one of the contacts for which a contact file exists within one or more of the first and second user collections;
- wherein the first user collection stores one or more contact files associated with a particular contact, the second user collection stores one or more contact files associated with the particular contact, and the firm collection stores the duplicate contact file associated with the particular contact file stored within the first and second user collections;
- an administration routine stored in the memory and executed by the processor, wherein the administration routine detects when the first user makes a change to the one or more contact files associated with the particular contact within the first user collection, generates an event action in response to detecting the change, the event action consisting of an accept action, a review action, a submit action, or a follow-up action, and sends a message including the event action to the administrator interface, wherein the changed contact file includes data pertaining to one or more contacts other than the first user with access to the changed first user collection;
- wherein the message to the administrator interface includes information related to the nature of the change made to the one or more contact files associated with the particular contact within the first user collection;
- a change management routine stored in the memory and executed by the processor wherein the change management routine receives a response to the event action from the administrator interface, and processes the response by one or more of approving, rejecting, or following-up on the event action with the second user having the second user collection that includes the common data; and

- wherein, upon approving the change, the relationship management system makes a corresponding change to the duplicate contact file associated with the particular contact within the firm collection.

Because the office action fails to allege that the combination of de L'Etraz and Cheah teaches or suggests each and every element of claim 67, the action does not allege a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

2. Cheah Does Not Teach or Suggest Claim 67

It is admitted in the office action at page 5 that de l'Etraz does not disclose either the administration routine or the change management routine as generally recited in claim 67 and the action advances Cheah for disclosing the same. However, Cheah does not teach or suggest either routine as recited in claim 67. Despite the lack of alleging a proper *prima facie* case of obviousness, Cheah cannot teach or suggest at least the administration routine that detects changes made to contact files other than the first user with access to the changed plurality of first contact files, or the change management routine that processes an administrator's response to the change. Rather, as described above, Cheah discloses user and administrator actions within a system that only includes self-representative data in which changes to the data must always originate with and be controlled by the owner of that information. Therefore, Because neither de l'Etraz nor Cheah alone or in combination teach or suggest the recitations of amended claim 67, this claim is allowable.

G. Claims 2-17, 38-53, 56-59, 69, 70, and 74-80

Because each of the claims 2-17, 38-53, 56-59, 69, 70, and 74-80 depend from an allowable base claim, as discussed above, these claims are allowable. Additionally, none of the recitations is disclosed by either de l'Etraz and Cheah either alone or in combination, as alleged in the office action, and as discussed below.

Dependent claims 2 and 38 are directed to the change management routine of claim 1 and claim 37, respectively, including a user collection change routine adapted to make a change to the common data of a contact file associated with the particular contact within a second one of the user collections based on the change made to the common data of the corresponding second contact file associated with the particular contact within the firm collection. The office action alleges on page 6 that this element is disclosed by Cheah at col.

9, lines 45-64. However, no such disclosure can be found in this portion, or anywhere in Cheah. For at least this reason, claims 2 and 38 are allowable.

Dependent claims 3, 39, and 70 are generally directed to the event action recited in claims 1, 37, and 67, respectively, including a message to the administrator reflecting the nature of the detected change made to one of the contact files associated with a particular contact within one or more of the plurality of user collections. The office action alleges on page 6 and 7 that this element is disclosed by Cheah at col. 29, lines 38-59. However, no such disclosure can be found in this portion, or anywhere in Cheah. For at least this reason, claims 3, 39, and 70 are allowable.

Dependent claims 4 and 40 are directed to the administration routine of claim 1 and the administrator interface of claim 37, respectively, as further adapted to enable the administrator to accept or reject the detected change before the administration routine makes the change to the common data of the corresponding second contact file associated with the particular contact within the firm collection. The office action alleges on page 7 that this element is disclosed by Cheah at col. 22, lines 8-50. However, no such disclosure can be found in this portion, or anywhere in Cheah. For at least this reason, claims 4 and 40 are allowable.

Dependent claims 5, 41, and 56 are directed to the administration routine of claims 1, 37, and 54, respectively, including a rule database that stores rules pertaining to the manner in which the detected change is to be processed. The office action alleges on page 7 that this element is disclosed by Cheah at col. 19-20, lines 62-67 and 1-10, respectively. However, no such disclosure can be found in this portion, or anywhere in Cheah. For at least this reason, claims 5, 41, and 56 are allowable.

Dependent claims 6, 42, and 57 are directed to the rules of claims 5, 41, and 56, respectively, being changeable by the administrator. The office action alleges on page 7 that this element is disclosed by Cheah at col. 23, lines 30-39, respectively. However, no such disclosure can be found in this portion, or anywhere in Cheah. For at least this reason, claims 6, 42, and 57 are allowable.

Dependent claims 7, 43, and 58 are directed to the administration routine of claims 2, 38, and 53, respectively, being further adapted to process the detected change to

detect a suspected error within the detected change. The office action alleges on page 8 that this element is disclosed by Cheah at col. 24, lines 24-35, respectively. However, no such disclosure can be found in this portion, or anywhere in Cheah. For at least this reason, claims 7, 43, and 58 are allowable.

Dependent claims 8 and 44 are directed to the administration routine of claims 7 and 43, respectively, is further adapted to provide a message to the administrator reflecting a description of the suspected error within the detected change. The office action alleges on page 8 that this element is disclosed by Cheah at cols. 14-15, lines 66-8. However, no such disclosure can be found in this portion, or anywhere in Cheah. For at least this reason, claims 8 and 44 are allowable.

Dependent claim 59 is directed to the administration routine of claim 58 being further adapted to provide a message to the administrator reflecting the nature of the suspected error within the detected change. The office action does not allege that this element is disclosed by Cheah, but rather presents the recitations of claims 8 and 44. The office action alleges on page 8 that claim 59 is disclosed by Cheah at cols. 14-15, lines 66-8. However, no such disclosure can be found in this portion, or anywhere in Cheah. For at least this reason, claim 59 is allowable.

Dependent claims 9 is directed to each of the user collections of claim 2 including a change attribute that specifies a manner in which a change made to the common data of the firm collection is to be reflected within the user collection. The office action alleges on page 8 that this element is disclosed by Cheah at col. 30, lines 43-64. However, no such disclosure can be found in this portion, or anywhere in Cheah. For at least this reason, claim 9 is allowable.

Dependent claims 45 and 74 are directed to each of the user collections of claims 38 and 67, respectively, including a change attribute that specifies a manner in which a change made to the firm collection is to be reflected within the user collection. The office action does not allege that this element is disclosed by Cheah, but rather presents the recitation of claim 9. The office action alleges on page 8 that claims 45 and 74 is disclosed by Cheah at cols. 14-15, lines 66-8. However, no such disclosure can be found in this portion, or anywhere in Cheah. For at least this reason, claims 45 and 74 are allowable.

Dependent claims 10, 46 and 75 are directed to the change attribute of claims 9, 45, and 74, respectively, when set to a first value, specifies that a change to the firm collection is to be automatically made to the user collection. The office action alleges on page 8 that this element is disclosed by Cheah at col. 23, lines 40-47. However, no such disclosure can be found in this portion, or anywhere in Cheah. For at least this reason, claims 10, 46, and 75 are allowable.

Dependent claims 11, 47 and 76 are directed to the change attribute of claims 9, 45, and 74 when set to a first value, specifies that a change to the firm collection is to be reported to a user having access to the user collection for which the change attribute exists. The office action alleges on page 9 that this element is disclosed by Cheah at col. 30, lines 55-60. However, no such disclosure can be found in this portion, or anywhere in Cheah. For at least this reason, claims 11, 47, and 76 are allowable.

Dependent claims 12, 48, and 77 are directed to the change attribute of claims 9, 45, and 74, when set to a first value, specifies that a change to the firm collection is to be accepted by the user having access to the user collection for which the change attribute exists before being made to the user collection for which the change attribute exists. The office action alleges on page 9 that this element is disclosed by Cheah at col. 25, lines 52-67. However, no such disclosure can be found in this portion, or anywhere in Cheah. For at least this reason, claims 12, 48, and 77 are allowable.

Dependent claims 13, 49, and 78 are directed to each of the user collections of claims 2, 38, and 67, respectively, includes a visibility field that specifies if a change made to a contact file within the user collection is to be shared with the firm collection. The office action alleges on page 9 that this element is disclosed by Cheah at cols. 20-21, lines 55-9. However, no such disclosure can be found in this portion, or anywhere in Cheah. For at least this reason, claims 13, 49, and 78 are allowable.

Dependent claims 14, 50, and 79 are directed to each of the contact files of claims 13, 49, and 78, respectively, includes a plurality of contact information fields and wherein the visibility flag specifies a visibility of one of the contact information fields. The office action alleges on page 9-10 that this element is disclosed by Cheah at Fig. 18J and

cols. 20-21, lines 55-9. However, no such disclosure can be found in this portion, or anywhere in Cheah. For at least this reason, claims 14, 50, and 79 are allowable.

Dependent claims 15, 51, and 80 are directed to each of the contact files of claims 13, 49, and 78, respectively, including a plurality of contact information fields and wherein the visibility flag specifies a visibility of an entire contact file. The office action alleges on page 10 that this element is disclosed by Cheah at Fig. 18J and cols. 20-21, lines 55-9. However, no such disclosure can be found in this portion, or anywhere in Cheah. For at least this reason, claims 15, 51, and 80 are allowable.

Dependent claims 16 and 52 are directed to the administration routine of claims 1 and 38, respectively, is further adapted to process the detected change to detect the addition of the first contact file for a contact within one of the user collections for which the second contact file already exists within the firm collection. The office action alleges on page 10 that this element is disclosed by Cheah at cols. 27-28, lines 53-6. However, no such disclosure can be found in this portion, or anywhere in Cheah. For at least this reason, claims 16 and 52 are allowable.

Dependent claims 17 and 53 are directed to the administration routine of claims 2 and 38, respectively, are further adapted to process the detected change to detect a user request for the administrator to make a change to the firm collection. The office action alleges on page 10 that this element is disclosed by Cheah at col. 26, lines 37-54. However, no such disclosure can be found in this portion, or anywhere in Cheah. For at least this reason, claims 17 and 53 are allowable.

Dependent claim 69 is directed to each user collection of claim 67 being accessible by a different user and further comprising a display routine stored on a computer-readable medium, wherein the display routine is adapted to display the data pertaining to different contacts stored within each user collection to the user having access to the user collection. The office action alleges on page 11 that this element is disclosed by Cheah at col. 18, lines 28-39, Fig. 18C, and cols. 16-17, lines 62-42. However, no such disclosure can be found in this portion, or anywhere in Cheah. For at least this reason, claim 69 is allowable.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendment and arguments, the applicant submits the pending application is in condition for allowance, and such action is requested at the examiner's earliest opportunity. The examiner is encouraged to contact the applicant's undersigned attorney with any questions regarding this response or the application as a whole at the telephone number indicated below. If there are any additional fees or refunds required, the Commissioner is directed to charge or debit Deposit Account No. 13-2855.

Dated: February 5, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Andrew R. Smith

Registration No.: 62,162

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300

Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357

(312) 474-6300

Attorney for Applicant